

[10191/3835]

**INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT**  
**International Application No. PCT/DE 03/00128**

**I. Basis of the report**

1. This report has been drawn on the basis of (*Substitute sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to the report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17))*):

The description, pages:

1-9 as originally filed

The claims, Nos.:

1-16 as originally filed

The drawings, sheets/fig.:

1/1 as originally filed

**V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1. STATEMENT**

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims 1-16

Inventive Step (IS)

Yes: Claims

No: Claims 1-16

Industrial Applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims 1-16

No: Claims

**2. CITATIONS AND EXPLANATIONS**  
**see appended sheet**

**Re: Point V**

**Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

1. Although Claims 10, 15, 16 have been written as separate, independent claims, they seem, however, in fact to refer to one and the same object and obviously differ from one another only by deviating definitions of the object for which protection is sought, or by the terminology used for this object's features. The claims are thus not condensed. Moreover, the claims overall are lacking in clarity since, due to the plurality of independent claims, it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the object for which protection is sought, thereby exacerbating for third parties the determination of the scope of protection in an unreasonable manner. This is the reason why Claims 10, 15, 16 do not meet the requirements of Article 6 PCT.
2. Reference is made to the following document:  
D1: US B1 6,314,307 (CHARRON DIDIER) November 6, 2001  
(2001-11-06)
3. The present application does not meet PCT requirements because the object of Claims 1, 10, 15, 16 is not novel according to Article 33(2) PCT.
  - 3.1 D1 discloses all features of Claims 1, 10, 15, 16. See in particular column 3, lines 39 through 46; column 7, lines 13 through 31; illustrations 3, 8.
4. D1 discloses all features of dependent Claims 2 through 9, 11 through 14. (Article 33(2) PCT).

What Is Claimed Is:

1. A method for monitoring the operating readiness of two memory elements (18, 20) assigned to an electronic unit (10), in which a supply voltage of the electronic unit (10) is monitored, the memory elements being operated using an operating voltage that is different compared to the supply voltage, the operating voltage being in a specified range so that the appropriate memory element is operational, wherein when it is detected, based on the monitoring of the supply voltage, that the operating voltage of one of the two memory elements is no longer in the specified range, program code is processed from the memory element whose operating voltage is in the specified range.
2. The method as recited in Claim 1, in which the monitoring of the supply voltage takes place in that it is initially divided down.
3. The method as recited in Claim 2, in which the supply voltage divided down is cyclically measured using an analog-digital converter (14).
4. The method as recited in Claim 2, in which the supply voltage divided down is cyclically read in at a general purpose input (22) of an electronic computing unit (12).
5. The method as recited in Claim 2, in which the supply voltage divided down is analyzed at an interrupt input (24) of an electronic computing unit (12).
6. The method as recited in Claim 1, in which the supply voltage is entered into a comparator (16) whose output signal is analyzed for monitoring the supply

voltage.

7. The method as recited in Claim 6, in which the output signal of the comparator (16) is cyclically read in at a general purpose input (22) of an electronic computing unit (12).

8. The method as recited in Claim 6, in which the output signal of the comparator (16) is analyzed at an interrupt input (24) of an electronic computing unit (12).

9. The method as recited in one of Claims 1 through 8, in which the operating voltage of the at least one memory element (18, 20) is monitored in addition to the supply voltage of the electronic unit (10).

10. An electronic unit that is operated using a supply voltage and that has two memory elements (18, 20) assigned to it, the electronic unit (10) being designed in such a way that monitoring of the supply voltage of the electronic unit (10) is provided for monitoring the readiness for operation of the two memory elements (18, 20), the memory elements being operated using an operating voltage that is different compared to the supply voltage, the operating voltage being in a specified range so that the appropriate memory element is operational, wherein the electronic unit is designed in such a way that when it is detected, based on the monitoring of the supply voltage, that the operating voltage of one of the two memory elements is no longer in the specified range, program code is processed from the memory element whose operating voltage is in the specified range.

11. The electronic unit as recited in Claim 10,

which includes an electronic computing unit (12).

12. The electronic unit as recited in Claim 10 or Claim 11, in which the at least one memory element (18, 20) is a flash memory element (18, 20).

13. The electronic unit as recited in one of Claims 10 through 13 [sic; 12], in which an analog-digital converter (14) is provided for monitoring the supply voltage.

14. The electronic unit as recited in one of Claims 10 through 13, in which a comparator (16) is provided for monitoring the supply voltage.

15. A computer program having program code means to execute a method as recited in one of Claims 1 through 9, when the computer program is executed on a computer or a suitable computing unit, in particular a computing unit (12) in an electronic unit (10) as recited in Claim 11.

16. A computer program product having program code means which are stored on a computer readable data medium to execute a method as recited in one of Claims 1 through 9, when the computer program is executed on a computer or a suitable computing unit, in particular a computing unit (12) in an electronic unit (10) as recited in Claim 11.